

REMARKS

This application has been amended by rewriting claims 1, 5, 8, 10 and 12 and amending claim 4. Claims 1-13 remain in the application for reconsideration.

The Examiner objected to claims 5-6, 8, 10, 12-13 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 5, 8, 10 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and are therefore believed allowable. Claims 6 and 13 depend from a rewritten independent claim, and are therefore believed allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Der Lely et al. '291. Claim 1 has been rewritten. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to rewritten claim 1.

It is believed that the original language of claim 1 could have been misinterpreted as covering a wheel with tines extending through both the first and second sets of apertures, simultaneously. It is believed clear from the specification that only one of the two sets of apertures is used at a given time. The second set of apertures are left open (or used for connectors for a wind shield – as set forth in claims 10 and 12), for use once the first set of apertures have become worn.

Claim 1 has therefore been amended to more clearly recite the fact that the number of tine legs is equal to the number of apertures in each of the two sets of apertures, and further that the tine legs extend through either the first or

the second set of apertures – not both. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Van Der Lely et al. '291.

While the applicant agrees with the Examiner's assertion that Van Der Lely arguably discloses two sets of tine apertures through a rim, revised claim 1 clearly calls for one set of the two apertures to be free of tines. Van Der Lely discloses and claims all of the tine apertures to be filled with tines. There is nothing in this reference that would suggest that one of the two sets of tine apertures be left empty. It is therefore believed that claim 1, as rewritten, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, Van Der Lely '291. Claim 1, as rewritten, is believed allowable.

Claims 2-4, 9, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Der Lely '291 in view of Spindler and/ or Ryan. Claims 2-4, 7, 9, 11 and 13 depend directly or indirectly from rewritten claim 1, and are therefore believed allowable.

Because the claims have been rewritten so as to include a total of five independent claims, a payment in the amount of \$88.00 to cover two additional independent claims (small entity), is enclosed herewith.

For the reasons above, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



George R. Nimmer, Reg. No. 21, 004
Attorney of Record